

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Crl.Misc.No. 73808-M of 2006

Charanjit Singh and another

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...RESPONDENTS

Crl.Misc.No. 74099-M of 2006

Gurdev Singh and another

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...RESPONDENTS

Crl.Misc.No. 79895-M of 2006

Rajwant Singh

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF DECISION: FEBRUARY 1, 2007

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present: Mr. R.S. Bains, Advocate,
for the petitioners.
Mr.N.S.Gill, AAG, Punjab.
Mr.Vipul Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the complainant.

...

This order shall dispose of three Criminal Misc.petitions for anticipatory bail bearing Crl.Misc.No.73808-M of 2006 filed by Charanjit Singh and Smt.Kuljit Kaur, Crl.Misc.No.74099-M of 2006 filed by Gurdev Singh and Smt.Gurmeet Kaur and Crl.Misc.No.79895-M of 2006 filed by Rajwant Singh, in case FIR No..186 dated 6.3.2006 registered under Section 420 IPC at Police Station Jandiala, Police District Majitha, District Amritsar.

I have heard the counsel for the parties.

During investigation, the offence under Sections 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC have also been added in the aforesaid case. Undisputedly, Chanan Singh was the owner of the property in question. After his death, the said property was inherited equally by his two sons, namely, Jagtar Singh and Rajwant Singh. Jagtar Singh died on 2.1.2006. After his death, the aforesaid complaint was filed by his wife Sukhdeep Kaur alleging therein that her brother-in-law Rajwant Singh in connivance with other accused, his wife Kuljit Kaur, brother-in-law Charanjit Singh, her sister-in-law Gurmit Kaur and her husband, has got transferred the land of Jagtar Singh in their favour. Counsel for the petitioners referred to the agreement (Annexure P2/T) arrived at between the parties, the statements of the complainant and her son recorded by the Assistant Collector Ist Grade, Amritsar-1 (Annexures P3/T and P4/T), while recording the mutation, and the said mutation was subsequently sanctioned on the basis of the compromise. In view of the said fact, the arrest of the petitioners was stayed subject to their joining the investigation.

Counsel for the petitioners contends that in terms of the interim orders dated December 4, 2006, December 8, 2006 and December 21, 2006, all the petitioners have joined the investigation. This fact has not been disputed by the State counsel.

In view of the above, the interim orders dated December 4, 2006, December 8, 2006 and December 21, 2006 are made absolute on the same terms and conditions.

Disposed of accordingly.

February 1, 2007
vkg

(SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
JUDGE